

Nucleon matrix elements of twist-3 and 4 operators from the instanton vacuum[†]

J. Balla^a, M.V. Polyakov^{a,b} and C. Weiss^a

^a*Institut für Theoretische Physik II, Ruhr-Universität Bochum,
D-44780 Bochum, Germany*

^b*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina,
St.Petersburg 188350, Russia*

Abstract

The spin-dependent twist-3 and 4 nucleon matrix elements $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ describing power corrections to the Bjorken and Ellis-Jaffe sum rules are computed in the instanton vacuum. A systematic expansion in the small packing fraction of the instanton medium, $\bar{\rho}/\bar{R} \ll 1$, is performed. We find that the twist-3 matrix element $d^{(2)}$ is suppressed [of order $(\bar{\rho}/\bar{R})^4$], while the twist-4 matrix element $f^{(2)}$ is of order unity. Numerically, $d^{(2)} \ll f^{(2)}$. The small value of $d^{(2)} \sim 10^{-3}$ obtained from instantons is consistent with the recent E143 measurements of the structure function g_2 , where $d^{(2)}$ enters at the same level as the twist-2 contribution.

[†] Oral contribution to the 8th International Conference on the Structure of Baryons (Baryons '98), Bonn, Sep. 22-26, 1998; to appear in the Proceedings.

In QCD, the quantitative description of deep-inelastic scattering and other related processes comes down to a study of matrix elements of certain composite operators in the nucleon state. The well-known parton distributions, which parametrize the non-power suppressed part of the structure functions, are given by matrix elements of operators of twist 2. In addition, there is a large number of observables related to operators of non-leading twist (> 2). One example are power corrections to the Bjorken sum rule [1, 2]. To order $1/Q^2$:

$$\int_0^1 dx g_1^{p-n}(x, Q^2) = \frac{1}{6} a_{\text{NS}}^{(0)} + \frac{M_N^2}{27Q^2} \left(a_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} + 4d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} + 4f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $a^{(0)}, a^{(2)}$ denote the matrix elements of twist-2 operators, with $a_{\text{NS}}^{(0)} = (g_A)_{\text{NS}}$, while $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ parametrize, respectively, the proton matrix element of the twist-3 spin-2 and the twist-4 spin-1 operators:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle PS | O_{\text{NS}}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} + O_{\text{NS}}^{\beta\alpha\gamma} | PS \rangle - \text{traces} \\ &= 2M_N d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \left[2P^\alpha P^\beta S^\gamma - P^\gamma P^\beta S^\alpha - P^\alpha P^\gamma S^\beta + (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta) - \text{traces} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\langle PS | O_{\text{NS}}^{\alpha\beta\alpha} | PS \rangle = 2M_N^3 f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} S^\beta, \quad (3)$$

$$O_{\text{NS}}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}(x) = g \bar{\psi}(x) \tau^3 \gamma^\alpha \tilde{G}^{\beta\gamma}(x) \psi(x). \quad (4)$$

Knowledge of the values of $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ would allow one to extend the QCD analysis of the Bjorken and Ellis–Jaffe sum rules to low values of Q^2 , where data with good statistics is available, which could be of interest *e.g.* for an accurate determination of α_S . Similar expressions can be written for the flavor-singlet part of g_1 (Ellis–Jaffe SR), as well as for the GLS sum rule for F_3 , see Refs.[1, 3].

It should be stressed that the parameters $d^{(2)}, f^{(2)}$, and the like, are universal characteristics of the nucleon, whose significance extends far beyond power corrections to g_1 . For instance, the twist-3 matrix element $d^{(2)}$ appears at leading twist level (*i.e.* not power suppressed relative to twist-2) in the third moment of the structure function g_2 [1, 2]:

$$\int_0^1 dx x^2 g_2^{p-n}(x, Q^2) = -\frac{1}{9} a_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{9} d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} + O\left(\frac{1}{Q^2}\right) \quad (5)$$

Also, the twist-4 matrix element $f^{(2)}$ can be related, via the heavy-quark expansion, to the charm contribution to g_1 [4]. Thus, these matrix elements can in principle be determined by combining results of different measurements. In order to compute them from first principles, one needs a theory of the nonperturbative effects giving rise to quark–gluon correlations in the nucleon.

There is by now overwhelming evidence — both from phenomenology as well as from lattice simulations [5] — for an important role of instanton-type vacuum fluctuations in determining the properties of the low-energy hadronic world [6]. The so-called instanton vacuum approximates the ground state of Yang–Mills theory by a medium of instantons

and antiinstantons, with quantum fluctuations about them, which is stabilized by instanton interactions [7]. The coupling constant is fixed at a scale of the order of the inverse average size of instantons in the medium, $\bar{\rho}^{-1} \simeq 600 \text{ MeV}$. The most important property of this picture is the diluteness of the instanton medium, meaning that the ratio of the average size of instantons in the medium to their average distance, $\bar{R}$, is small: $\bar{\rho}/\bar{R} \simeq 1/3$ [6, 7]. The existence of this small parameter makes possible a systematic analysis of non-perturbative effects in this approach.

In particular, the instanton vacuum explains the dynamical breaking of chiral symmetry [8, 9]. It happens due to the delocalization of the fermionic zero modes associated with the individual (anti-) instantons in the medium. Using the $1/N_c$ -expansion one derives from the instanton vacuum an effective low-energy theory, whose degrees of freedom are pions (Goldstone bosons) and massive “constituent” quarks. It is described by the effective action [8]

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x) \left[i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - MF(\vec{\partial}) e^{i\gamma_5 \tau^a \pi^a(x)} F(\vec{\partial}) \right] \psi(x). \quad (6)$$

Here, M is the dynamical quark mass generated by the spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry; parametrically

$$M\bar{\rho} \sim \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\bar{R}} \right)^2, \quad (7)$$

and $F(k)$ is a form factor proportional to the wave function of the instanton zero mode, which drops to zero for momenta of order $k \sim \bar{\rho}^{-1}$. Mesonic correlation functions, computed either with the effective action, Eq.(6), using the $1/N_c$ -expansion [8], or by more elaborate numerical simulations [6], show excellent agreement with phenomenology. The nucleon can be described, within the $1/N_c$ -expansion, as a chiral soliton of the effective theory [10]. This field-theoretic description of the nucleon gives a good account not only of its static properties, but also of the twist-2 parton distributions [11].

Given the general success of the instanton vacuum in describing hadronic properties, it is natural to apply this approach to the calculation of matrix elements of higher-twist operators such as Eq.(2) and (3). A general method for computing matrix elements of quark-gluon operators in the instanton vacuum has been developed in Ref.[12]. Due to the diluteness of the instanton medium the dominant contribution to the matrix element is obtained by substituting for the gluon operator in Eqs.(2) and (3) the classical gluon field of a *single* (anti-) instanton. The interaction of the instanton with the fermions through the zero modes then allows one to replace the original QCD operator (normalized at $\mu = \bar{\rho}^{-1}$) by an effective operator, expressed in terms of the quark and pion fields of the effective theory. It was shown in Ref.[3] that identities following from the QCD equations of motion are fully preserved in this approach. For the operator Eq.(4) the effective operator, after integration over the instanton coordinates, takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} “O”_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \tau^3 \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \gamma_\alpha \psi(x) \times \frac{(-M)}{N_c} \int d^4z f_{\beta\gamma,\mu\nu}(x-z) \\ &\times \left[\bar{\psi}(z) \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \gamma_5 \sigma_{\mu\nu} F(\vec{\partial}) e^{i\gamma_5 \tau^a \pi^a(z)} F(\vec{\partial}) \psi(z) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the function $f_{\beta\gamma,\mu\nu}(x)$ describes the (anti-) selfdual field of the (anti-) instanton in singular gauge,

$$G_{\beta\gamma}^a(x)_{I(\bar{I})} = \pm \tilde{G}_{\beta\gamma}^a(x)_{I(\bar{I})} = \frac{1}{g} f_{\beta\gamma,\mu\nu}(x) \begin{cases} \bar{\eta}_{\mu\nu}^a \\ \eta_{\mu\nu}^a \end{cases}, \quad (9)$$

$$f_{\beta\gamma,\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{8\rho^2}{(x^2 + \rho^2)^2} \left(\frac{x_\mu x_\beta}{x^2} \delta_{\gamma\nu} + \frac{x_\nu x_\gamma}{x^2} \delta_{\mu\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mu\beta} \delta_{\gamma\nu} \right). \quad (10)$$

In Eq.(8) the gluon field of the QCD operator has been replaced by a chirally-odd instanton-induced quark vertex proportional to the dynamical quark mass, M . Note that, as in the effective Lagrangian, Eq.(6), chiral invariance is preserved due the presence of the pion field.

The matrix element of the effective operator, Eq.(8), can now be computed in the effective low-energy theory. At this point characteristic differences between the different spin projections of the operator emerge. A parametrically large contribution can only come from contractions of the four-fermionic operator, Eq.(8), with closed quark loops, in which the quark momenta run up to the ultraviolet cutoff, $\bar{\rho}^{-1}$ (see Ref.[3] for details). One finds that in the case of the twist-4 matrix element, $f^{(2)}$, Eq.(3), the loop is $\propto \bar{\rho}^{-2}$ (“quadratically divergent”), while in the case of the twist-3 matrix element, $d^{(2)}$, Eq.(2), it is only of order $\log M\bar{\rho}$, (“logarithmically divergent”). As a result, we obtain a parametric difference of the twist-4 and 3 matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{twist 4: } f^{(2)} &\sim (M\bar{\rho})^0 \sim \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{R}\right)^0, \\ \text{twist 3: } d^{(2)} &\sim (M\bar{\rho})^2 \log M\bar{\rho} \sim \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{R}\right)^4 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{R}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This remarkable result can be traced back to two circumstances: the $O(4)$ symmetry of the field of a single (anti-) instanton, and the diluteness of the instanton medium.

The parametric difference between the twist-3 and 4 matrix elements also reflects itself in the numerical values. For the flavor non-singlet nucleon matrix element $f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ (the NS part is leading in the $1/N_c$ -expansion) we obtain a value of -0.1 , while $d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ was estimated to be of the order of 10^{-3} .¹ Thus, the instanton vacuum implies a clear numerical ordering of higher-twist matrix elements: $|d^{(2)}| \ll |f^{(2)}|$. Again we stress that this ordering is not accidental, but a direct consequence of qualitative properties of the instanton medium. This is at variance with the QCD sum rules estimates, and also of bag model calculations, which typically give values of $f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ and $d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ of the same order, see Table 1. (For a critical discussion of the QCD sum rule calculations see Ref.[17].) Note also that the instanton result for $f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ agrees in sign with the QCD sum rule results, but not with the bag model.

It is interesting that the small value of $d^{(2)}$ suggested by the instanton vacuum seems to be in agreement with recent measurements of g_2 by the E143 collaboration. Ref.[16]

¹An accurate calculation of $d^{(2)}$ in this approach would require to take into account two-instanton contributions in the effective operator; this calculation is presently being done. The order-of-magnitude estimate in Ref.[3] is based only on the one-instanton contribution.

	$f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \times 10^1$	$d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \times 10^1$	scale/GeV ²
Instanton vacuum [3]	-1.0	~ 0.01	0.4
QCD sum rules [13]	-2.0	0.7	1
QCD sum rules [14]	-0.7	0.7	1
Bag model [15]	1.1	0.6	5
E143 [16]		0.024 ± 0.78	5

Table 1: Numerical results for the flavor-nonsinglet spin-dependent twist-4 and 3 matrix elements $f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \equiv 3(f_p^{(2)} - f_n^{(2)})$ and $d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$, Eqs.(2) and (3). The instanton result for $d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$ is an order-of-magnitude estimate (see the text).

reports a value of $d_{\text{NS}}^{(2)} \equiv 3(d_p^{(2)} - d_n^{(2)}) = (2.4 \pm 78) \times 10^{-3}$, which agrees well with the order-of-magnitude estimate of Ref.[3] (note that $d_p^{(2)}$ and $d_n^{(2)}$ individually are of comparable magnitude, see Ref.[16]). This value is much smaller than our estimate for $f_{\text{NS}}^{(2)}$, which is of order 10^{-1} . Unfortunately, the present data are not sufficient to unambiguously extract $f^{(2)}$ from power corrections with sufficient accuracy in order to make a quantitative comparison of $f^{(2)}$ and $d^{(2)}$ [18]. It would be interesting to see if by *imposing* the condition $|d^{(2)}| \ll |f^{(2)}|$ from the start one could extract $f^{(2)}$ more accurately.

To summarize, we have shown that the instanton vacuum with its inherent small parameter, $\bar{\rho}/\bar{R}$, implies a parametrical (and numerical) hierarchy of the spin-dependent twist-3 and 4 matrix elements: $|d^{(2)}| \ll |f^{(2)}|$. This qualitative prediction can be confronted with structure function data. Extending this analysis further (*e.g.* to higher moments and to other structure functions) one could use the rich information available from DIS to learn about properties of non-perturbative vacuum fluctuations.

It is a pleasure to thank D.I. Diakonov, V.Yu. Petrov, P.V. Pobylitsa for many interesting discussions, and K. Goeke for encouragement and support.

References

- [1] E.V. Shuryak and A.I. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. **B 199**, 451 (1982); Nucl. Phys. **B 201**, 141 (1982).
- [2] B. Ehrnsperger, L. Mankiewicz and A. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. **B 323**, 439 (1994).
- [3] J. Balla, M.V. Polyakov and C. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. **B 510**, 327 (1997).
- [4] M.V. Polyakov, A. Schäfer and O.V. Teryaev, Preprint RUB-TPII-22-98, hep-ph/9812393.
- [5] For a recent review, see: J.W. Negele, in Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory (Lattice 97), Edited by C.T.H. Davies *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B** Proc. Suppl. Also: P. van Baal, same conference.

- [6] For a review, see: T. Schäfer and E.V. Shuryak, Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 323 (1998).
- [7] D. Diakonov and V. Petrov, Nucl. Phys. **B 245**, 259 (1984).
- [8] D. Diakonov and V. Petrov, Nucl. Phys. **B 272**, 457 (1986); Preprint LNPI-1153 (1986), published (in Russian) in: Hadron Matter under Extreme Conditions, Naukova Dumka, Kiev (1986), p. 192.
- [9] For a review, see: D. Diakonov, Lecture at the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi”, Varenna, Italy, Jun. 27 – Jul. 7, 1995, hep-ph/9602375.
- [10] D. Diakonov, V. Petrov and P. Pobylitsa, Nucl. Phys. **B 306**, 809 (1988).
- [11] D.I. Diakonov, V.Yu. Petrov, P.V. Pobylitsa, M.V. Polyakov and C. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. **B 480**, 341 (1996); Phys. Rev. **D 56**, 4069 (1997).
- [12] D.I. Diakonov, M.V. Polyakov and C. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. **B 461**, 539 (1996).
- [13] I.I. Balitskii, V.M. Braun and A.V. Kolesnichenko, Phys. Lett. **B 242**, 245 (1990); Erratum Phys. Lett. **B 318**, 648 (1993).
- [14] E. Stein, P. Górnicki, L. Mankiewicz and A. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. **B 353**, 107 (1995); E. Stein *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 343**, 369 (1995).
- [15] X. Ji and P. Unrau, Phys. Lett. **B 333**, 228 (1994).
- [16] E143 Collaboration (K. Abe *et al.*), Phys. Rev. **D 58**, 112003 (1998).
- [17] B.L. Ioffe, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **60**, 1707 (1997); Lecture at the St.Petersburg Winter School on Theoretical Physics, Febr. 23-28, 1998, hep-ph/9804238.
- [18] X. Ji and W. Melnitchouk, Phys. Rev. **D 56**, 1 (1997).